

SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

17th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Volume XVII, Number 19

P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015

December 1, 1987

Another Round of Negotiations

US Taking Tough Stance on Science Pact with Japan

The openness of American science is facing greater scrutiny as the Reagan Administration intensifies its demands for reciprocal access to Japanese laboratories and protection of US intellectual property rights. The Red menace used to be the main impulse for scientific protectionism, but now there's a powerful newcomer, industrial competitiveness. And it's gaining force, aided by the myths and realities of foreign accessibility to research in Japan.

Many foreigners are appalled by this development, which led to the exclusion of foreign representatives in July from a major US government-sponsored conference on Commercialization of Superconductivity (see p. 4 for a tart foreign commentary on that celebrated event). Also distressed are members of the old-line federal science bureaucracy, where the Reaganites are generally disdained as clumsy ideologues messing with complex relationships that they don't understand. Whatever the case, the issue of international scientific relations has risen on the White House agenda of concerns.

One outcome is that the US is now trying to drive a

New GAO Inquiries on NSF, NIH—P. 5 NIH Chiefs Cool on AIDS Bill—P. 8

hard bargain on scientific dealings with Japan, which the White House regards as a laggard in supporting basic research and an unabashed scientific parasite. Another is that India, notoriously casual about patent protection, has been advised to reform its ways if it expects to advance its ties with American research organizations and high-tech industry.

On Capitol Hill and in other forums, Administration officials say the US has consented long enough to what they regard as a ripoff. Reference is often made to the presence of some 320 long-term Japanese guest researchers at the National Institutes of Health, with the US government financing their stays at a cost of about \$8 million a year. The visitors are not about to be banished, but the heat is on for Japan to match the hospitality.

An assessment of the situation must deal in nuances and slow-moving trends, since the US continues to play host to thousands of foreign researchers, and close academic and industrial relations thrive between American and foreign research organizations. But there are new elements in the picture:

First, more than it ever dreamed possible, science has

been granted its wish of political recognition as an indispensable ingredient of national power. Taking the scientists at face value, the Reagan competitiveness warriors say that if R&D is so valuable, let's not be casual about letting foreigners partake of our strength—unless they give us access to theirs.

Second, scientific reciprocity holds a high priority in the office of White House Science Adviser William R. Graham. Only 13 months on the job, Graham is an unreconstructed right-wing Reaganite enthusiast, fresh on the Washington scene while his ideological brethren are weary and thinning out.

(Continued on page 2)

In Brief

Two months into fiscal 1988, the managers of federal R&D spending share in the general uncertainty about how much money will be available for their programs for the remainder of the year. The verdict won't be in until Congress and the White House finally settle on a deficit-reduction scheme. In the meantime, federal agencies are pacing their spending at 75 percent of fiscal 1987.

The restraint is aimed at playing it safe, just in case. But there's a good chance that major segments of R&D spending could actually rise somewhat above last year's levels when the budget finally gets sorted out. If the budget negotiators fall back on Gramm-Rudman's automatic cuts, the mandated 8.7 percent reductions for domestic programs would still leave NSF, NIH, and NASA with some growth. But if the cutting is done selectively, the health and industrial competitiveness lobbies can match any of the others in clamoring for favored treatment for research.

Deficit pressures, coupled with Congressional skepticism, have had a decisive impact on the Administration's rapid-growth plans for the Strategic Defense Initiative. The Administration had originally planned to have SDI close to the \$6 billion mark this year, but it now looks as though it will come out of the budget strife with \$3.9 billion, a slight increase over last year's figure.

But one area of research is fast-growing and untouchable: AIDS. The NIH budget for AIDS stood at \$252 million in 1987. The Administration requested \$422 million. The House and Senate haven't yet settled on a figure, but NIH Director James B. Wyngaarden told his semi-annual Advisory Committee meeting last month that the appropriation will probably be about \$50 million above the White House request.

... OSTP Pushes to Broaden Its Authority in Exchanges

(Continued from page 1)

Graham's predecessor, George A. Keyworth II, put his zest into redeploying R&D funds from applied research in government labs to basic research in universities, and devoted little effort to linking science policy to the major political passions of the Reagan White House. Graham, generally regarded in Washington's career R&D ranks as the most political of presidential science advisers, has been far more attentive to serving the political interests of the White House.

The major issue of the moment is renewal of the Non-Energy Agreement of 1980 between Japan and the US, so-called simply because it followed the energy agreement of 1979 and was written as a general framework for bilateral R&D ties. If the 1980 agreement simply evaporated without renewal, probably nothing but a symbol would be lost, and that wouldn't matter much in the existing pattern of sci-tech relations between the two countries. In fact, the original agreement expired in 1985 and, without much political notice, was extended to last May while official Washington, off and on, puzzled and squabbled about the future. It currently exists on a six-month extension.

The difference now is that Graham heads the White House Office of Science and Technology (OSTP) and he obviously regards the heretofore idle agreement as a potential umbrella over a wide range of Japanese-American research relations—with Graham holding the handle. The opportunity for this arises from the fact that OSTP is the designated agency for administering the US side of the Non-Energy Agreement, whereas other agreements are run on an agency-to-agency basis. Reaching for power is an old Washington tradition to which Graham heartily subscribes. Concurrent with his Japanese grab, he's also using the expiration process to take over the functions of the Biotechnology Sciences Coordinating Committee, a multi-agency body established two years ago to regulate biotechnology research and applications (SGR November 1).

Graham found the Japanese agreement issue simmering lightly within the White House science advisory complex when he took office in October 1986. Keyworth had assigned it to the Committee on International Science, Engineering, and Technology, part of the Federal Coordinating Council for Science and Technology, a sort of sub-cabinet of sci-tech agencies, tied to OSTP.

A series of interagency meetings brought out a variety of differences on how we should relate scientifically to our Japanese friends. The Commerce Department demanded more emphasis on patent protection and using American scientific ties to help open Japanese markets.

(Continued on page 3)

Japan Seeking US Postdocs

In a step aimed at countering the charge that it exploits Western science while curtaining off its own, Japan has expressed interest in footing the bill for 100 American and European postdocs to work in Japanese laboratories for extended periods.

The possibility was discussed in October in Tucson at the annual meeting of the US-Japan Cooperative Science Program, a collaboration, now in its 26th year, administered by the National Science Foundation and the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science.

As outlined by Takashi Mukaibo, Chairman of the Japanese side of the program, the 100 fellowships would be evenly divided between Europe and the US. In the US program, twenty-five fellows would be selected by NSF, five by the National Institutes of Health, and the remaining 20 from among applicants who would apply directly to Japanese research organizations. In collaboration with European research agencies, a similar selection process would be used there.

Mukaibo, who is President-emeritus of Tokyo University, said Japan would like to start the program in April 1988. That struck his American counterparts as a very short lead, given the customary slow pace of academic movements. But, as a matter of fact, there's no hurry at this point, since Mukaibo said the program still has to be approved by the Ministry of Finance. A decision is expected early in 1988.

Whatever the outcome, increasingly harsh words from American research administrators have been followed by an easing of access to Japanese research activities. These include programs of the Ministry of International Trade and Industry, traditionally the most restrictive toward foreign researchers.

ISSN 0048-9581

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1987

Editor and Publisher

Daniel S. Greenberg

Associate Publisher

Wanda J. Reif

European Correspondent

Francois Seguier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report, Inc.*, twice monthly, except once each in January, July, August, and September. Annual subscription: Institutions, \$225.00 (two years, \$395.00). Information about bulk and individual rates upon request. Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second-class postage at Washington, D.C. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on University Microfilms International. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six weeks of publication date.

... Japanese Could Simply Wait for Next US Election

(Continued from page 2)

The National Science Foundation insisted that it was doing nicely in its dealings with the Japanese and that the US should move gingerly to avoid upsetting what NSF regarded as a healthy growth of reciprocity on the part of Japanese research institutions. Within OSTP that cheery attitude is regarded with disdain. As one staff member there remarked to SGR, "NSF is happy with nickel and dime stuff."

NIH, preoccupied with research and politically sheltered by Congress, thinks the White House should be delighted with all that bargain-price Japanese talent, rather than ignorantly grouching about it. NIH remains puzzled by and oblivious of the whole flap. Meanwhile, the State Department's Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, a Congressionally mandated, barely welcome appendage to the Foggy Bottom bureaucracy, regards Graham as an interloper on its territory. The Bureau lacks decisive power, but it's the convening authority for working out the US position, and thereby possesses some considerable influence over the inter-agency proceedings.

Last February, Graham visited Tokyo to spell out a US position that was strong on demands for widened access to Japanese laboratories and more Japanese spending on basic research, which even the Japanese

concede has been shortchanged in their spending priorities. The Japanese, after insisting they were independently moving along those lines, left the impression with some US officials that they did not take kindly to Graham's muscleman tactics in the traditionally delicate field of diplomacy. They particularly noted that many opportunities for American participation in Japanese research activities were going unused for lack of American candidates.

A Japanese delegation visited Washington in October to continue the discussions, but that meeting concluded without final agreement. Graham and company are due to visit Japan on December 2 for another round.

A common view among Graham detractors, of whom there are many in the research agencies, is that he has so mucked up the negotiations that the Japanese will probably choose to wait out the final year of the Reagan Administration rather than sign an agreement on US terms. The reality of the matter is that the agreement isn't needed to sustain or expand the current collaborative activities. Furthermore, given the financial leverage that Japan holds in the American economy, the US is in no position to lay down the law to that country on any issue.

The links between science and industrial competitive-

(Continued on page 4)

In Various Episodes, US Has Stiffened Policy on R&D Ties

The anonymously stated view of one oldtimer in US international science relations is that "we're asking too much" in the current negotiations for renewal of the so-called Non-Energy science and technology agreement with Japan. Among the thorny items, he said, is a demand for the Japanese to finance research in the US. He forecasts that without a softening of the US position, the Japanese will choose to ride out the final year of the Reagan Administration and try again with its successor.

The viewpoint was stated to SGR on a non-attributable basis for the plain reason that federal research agency staff members sensibly don't want to tangle in public with the White House Science Office. But this source, and others, disapprovingly note a recent hardening of official US attitudes in international research relations, all occurring, or at least becoming visible, since William R. Graham became presidential Science Adviser in October 1986. What's not clear is whether Graham is merely the messenger or is delivering orders that originate in the National Security Council. What's plain, however, is that he's not offended by a tougher US stance.

Earlier this year, there was the last-minute exclusion of the Soviet Union from NSF's multi-national deep-sea drilling program—a White House-directed step that left Foundation officials fuming. National security was offered up as the rationale for the move, but oceanographic veterans dismiss that as nonsensical.

A restoration of US support for the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis—cut off at the beginning of the Reagan Administration—was in the works, but that, too, has been waylaid. IIASA, a 16-nation research center, located near Vienna, is widely regarded as a model of trans-ideological cooperation in frontier fields of systems research. The Reaganites bristled, however, at the spectacle of US and Soviet computer specialists working together, and canceled the American contribution. Private sources now keep the US role afloat financially. But, following an examination of IIASA's activities, the NSF was due to return with a \$500,000 contribution. The word is that pre-Graham, the White House Science Office approved the budget, but that the decision was reversed shortly after he took over.

Swiss Commentary: "Scientific Protectionism" Rising

Rarely has so much resentment been provoked for so little purpose. Proceeding from a sophomoric sense of national interest, White House Science Adviser William R. Graham banned foreign representatives from the US-government-sponsored conference last July in Washington on Commercial Applications of Superconductivity. Many of the excluded foreigners are posted here specifically to report home on American research affairs. They were not pleased, especially since the US praises international scientific collaboration and has been badgering its foreign friends to share the costs of some of our R&D mega-projects.

The following is from an editorial by Hans Peter Hertig, Science and Technology Counselor to the Swiss embassies in Washington and Ottawa. It appeared in the November Embassy of Switzerland Bulletin, a thrice-yearly limited-circulation report published by Hertig's office and distributed mainly to Swiss scientists in North America.

Over 1000 persons participated [in the Conference]. Not present were, however, the science attaches of various embassies despite their efforts to gain admission. They were barred on the grounds that there was a lack of space and that the event was a national one.

Admittedly, not much was lost by missing this Conference. The fact that the attending US firms are themselves locked in unyielding competitive combat guaranteed that no scientific sensations or technological wonder recipes would be disseminated. In fact, the Conference centered on the rather innocuous presentation of an 11-point program by the Administration calling for renewed efforts in the field of superconductivity research. Several days later, this program was made public. Currently, video tapes of the Conference can be obtained without difficulty.

And yet, the problem is of a different nature—is one of principle. The US authorities' refusal represents a noticeable and growing tendency—in the United States as well as in other nations—to withhold

promising scientific and technological knowledge from the international public and to prevent access to the potential economic competition. The ongoing race between the United States, Japan and Europe to win hi-tech supremacy leads to scientific protectionism: increasingly, scientific systems are being nationalized.

This development will ultimately only produce losers. Primary losers are the small nations like Switzerland which are dependent on the cooperation of the big ones and on international scientific programs. Hi-tech research today is so demanding and costly that it is beyond the capabilities of a small country. In Switzerland there are only a few enterprises in a restricted number of fields that on their own can compete with the world leaders. However, the research giants will also be losers in the long run. The spectacular advances we have seen in the past few years in the fields of the leading high technologies are the result of international efforts. Naturally, some nations enjoy privileged positions, carry the main burden of research activities. Yet important breakthroughs come from major economic competitors or from research "dwarfs." Superconductivity is no exception. On the contrary.

The opening salvo for the current race for higher superconductivity temperatures was fired one and a half years ago in Switzerland. While it is true that this took place in the laboratory of a major US corporation [IBM], it was under the leadership of a Swiss researcher in the, at the time, apparently particularly invigorating air of Zurich! Other significant contributions came from China and Japan. Behind the most outstanding work here in the United States stands a researcher born in China and educated in Taiwan. His teacher, a grand old man of US superconductivity research, emigrated decades ago from Germany.

Sealed laboratories, closed auditoriums and national barricades are the best means to quickly and effectively throttle the development in economically promising fields like micro-electronics, biotechnology and material science.

US Policy

(Continued from page 3)

ness and military power have long been trumpeted by academic scientific leaders seeking federal support, but now the chickens are coming home in unexpected fashion. At a meeting in November of science ministers of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD—consisting of 24 industrially advanced nations), Graham took the position that *laissez faire* can no longer be tolerated in the international division of

labor in science. Calling for the development of international ground rules for science and technology, he suggested that these should include equitable national support of basic research, reciprocity in access to research facilities, and principles for guiding admission to scientific meetings.

The danger lurking in this approach is that government becomes the scorekeeper and gatekeeper of international scientific relations. A bitter taste of how this

(Continued on page 5)

GAO Studying NSF Research Centers, NIH Budget Growth

At the request of Congressional committees, which is the customary origin of such things, the General Accounting Office is currently starting up studies of two sensitive matters in the affairs of science: the National Science Foundation's research centers program and the National Institutes of Health's big budget gains since 1980.

The studies were ordered by committees friendly to these agencies and are not aimed at digging for dirt. But they are bound to collect and analyze information that is usable by one or another of the many interests that are satisfied or aggrieved by the policies and practices of these mainstays of academic research. Both studies are scheduled to produce findings in time for appropriations hearings early next year, but they will continue beyond that period.

GAO, Congress's investigative service, is undertaking the NSF inquiry at the request of the Senate Commerce, Science, and Transportation Committee. The focus will be on the Engineering Research Centers pro-

gram, which got underway in 1985. The ERCs were the first wave in the Foundation's expansion of support for campus-based, multi-disciplinary centers aimed at establishing closer relations between academe and industry.

Behind the request for the GAO study is widespread anxiety in the scientific community that the centers will detract from NSF's traditional support of individual project grants. There's no danger of that, says NSF Director Erich Bloch, who insists that project grants are thriving while the centers program is growing (SGR June 1, 1987: "We're Still With You, NSF Assures 'Little Science' "). But the worries persist, often surfacing on the National Science Board, NSF's broadly based, 24-member policymaking body.

Thirteen centers are currently in operation under NSF's Engineering Directorate, three more are soon to be announced, and a new series, titled Science and Technology Centers, is in the works at several other

(Continued on page 6)

US Policy *(Continued from page 4)*

can work out has been seen in the Reagan Administration's frequent skirmishes with academe and various professional societies over foreign access to supercomputers and scientific meetings on advanced materials and electronics. Inspired by national security considerations, the restrictive rules have been administered by gumshoes notable only for their insensitivity and dim understanding of the scientific and academic cultures.

In response to Graham's suggestion, the OECD science ministers produced a statement calling for all the world to pitch in and support scientific research and training and access to knowledge. Next to come, they agreed, is a try at drafting guidelines. Glacial pace is standard at OECD; with the clock running out on the Reagan Administration, movement might not be even that fast. So, nothing is to be expected soon from OECD.

Along with reports of the Japanese feeling offended by Graham's operational style, there's word that one of his staff members, Deborah L. Wince, OSTP Assistant Director for International Affairs, created a good deal of annoyance during a recent visit to India in connection with a meeting of the US-India Commission on Science and Technology. Wince emphatically told SGR that her deliberations there were smooth and congenial. But, once again, the manifold detractors of the OSTP enterprise have enlivened the science-policy grapevine with gleeful accounts of the alleged episode.

As it's told, Wince was asked by US embassy officials in Delhi to steer clear of the issue of intellectual proper-

ty rights in her discussions with Indian officials. The subject is highly sensitive, since Indian firms are widely accused of patent piracy, and the US embassy has been pressuring the Indian government to do something about it. Nonetheless, it's said, Wince not only brought up the topic, but lectured a senior Indian government official about it, warning him that India's quest for closer ties with American science and high-tech activities could be injured unless the government acted to protect American patent interests. He, in turn—so the story goes—protested angrily to the US Ambassador, who angrily chastised Wince.

Wince says she did indeed discuss intellectual property rights with Indian officials, and linked the subject to closer research-related ties. The Indians, she said, are increasingly receptive to international recognition of such rights because of their prolific film industry and budding software industry. The conversations, she told SGR, involved no discord, either with the Indians or with American embassy officials.

Nonetheless, the Graham operation is widely regarded as an abrasive force that is damaging carefully cultivated international relations in a misguided pursuit of national advantage. As one old timer in science-policy affairs summarized it for SGR: Graham and company are blaming the Japanese for America's neglect of opportunities to tune into Japanese science; they somehow think Japan holds some responsibility for American neglect of Japanese language studies, and they think they can dictate science policy to the proud, economically powerful Japanese.—DSG

In Print: Biotech, Medical Research, US-India R&D

Biotechnology Research and Development Activities in Industry: 1984 and 1985 (NSF 87-311, 27 pp.), the first product of a new NSF series designed to track manpower and spending in rapidly developing technological fields. Among the main findings for the period studied: annual spending on biotech R&D rose by 20 percent, to \$1.1 billion, and employment of scientists and engineers reached 8000 in January 1986, a one-year increase of 12 percent.

Available without charge from: NSF, Division of Science Resources Studies, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/634-4634.

The Health of Biomedical Research Institutions (43 pp.) proceedings of June 1987 meeting of the Advisory Committee to the Director of the National Institutes of Health, a semi-annual, two-day bull session devoted to a single subject of current concern in the biomedical community, with a score of research chieftains, plus NIH senior staff and advisers, taking part. The discussions are presented in summary form, and excusably have that canned proceedings flavor. But candor and strong feelings come through on important and sensitive issues, including geographic distribution of research funds, difficulties of doing business with Washington,

and benefits and perils in academic-industrial relations.

A limited number of copies available, without charge, from: NIH, Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, Building One, Room 137, Bethesda, Md. 20892; attn. Ronald Geller; tel. 301/496-8070.

Indian Scientific Strength: Selected Opportunities for Indo-US Cooperation (237 pp.), proceedings of an NSF-sponsored invitational workshop in Washington last spring, part of a broad review of US scientific relations with India. The summary conclusion notes "high quality in particular areas of chemistry, physics, microelectronics, biotechnology, and materials science, and scope for increased US-India collaboration." On the other hand,

(Continued on page 7)

Fight that Jet Lag

Available without charge: the **Argonne Anti-Jet-Lag Diet**, highly regarded by many long-distance travelers and shift workers for resetting the biological clock; on wallet-size, plastic-coated cards, with a reading list on jet-lag biology. Order from: Office of Public Affairs, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Ave., Argonne, Ill. 60439; tel. 312/972-5575.

GAO (Continued from page 5)

NSF directorates. The existing centers actually take a small slice of NSF's funds—\$30 million out of an overall budget of \$1.6 billion. But it's the trend that inspires fears.

The GAO study will examine several matters, including the highly speculative question of whether these centers are actually helping industry, and how enthusiastically industry is responding to the requirement for matching funds and close participation. Also of interest are the criteria for selecting the few winners so far from the well over 200 universities that have applied for centers support.

The study will send questionnaires to the centers and to the industrial firms involved with them, and will also interview NSF officials running the program. GAO's schedule calls for briefing the Senate committee early next year and issuing a written report in September. A three-person GAO group, headed by Janet Mascia, is conducting the NSF study.

The NIH study, requested by the House Appropriations Subcommittee that handles the NIH budget, is focused on the big surge in biomedical research spending that occurred between 1980 and 1986. With the NIH budget having grown in that period from \$3.4 billion to \$5.5 billion, the House Subcommittee, chaired by Rep. William H. Natcher (D-Ky.), wants to know whether

more money is buying more research or is getting lost in the mysterious finances of academic science.

The first phase of the study will look at cost changes for personnel, equipment, supplies, and training. Information will be collected from several NIH institutes and a few grantee institutions.

The second step in the NIH study will involve audits of research projects at some institutions, plus an examination of the inflation index that NIH uses in assessing the purchasing power of its awards. The index, one of the lesser-known devices in science-government relations, is prepared by the Department of Commerce, and NIH relies upon it in arguments over whether a given budget represents a "real" loss, standstill, or gain.

Chairman Natcher is an unrestrained booster of NIH. The study is doubtlessly intended to reinforce his support of NIH in the worsening budget climate. Protected by its Congressional friends, NIH has eluded the Reagan budget ax, but conditions are getting tougher. It would be helpful for NIH if the GAO concludes that the biomedical inflation rate is eating up those big budget increases.

The NIH study is being conducted by a three-member GAO group headed by Larry Horinko. Here, too, a briefing for the Congressional subcommittee is scheduled for early next year, and a report will be published later.

In Print : NSF Guide, OTA List, IIASA, Etc.

(Continued from page 6)

"There was a consistent opinion that Indian scientists are above average but Indian research activity is below average, because of poor equipment, electrical power outages, inbreeding of faculty, and senior faculty setting a research agenda for several generations of scientists in their fields." The assessments, most by Americans with experience in Indian laboratories, vary widely; some are strikingly scathing about incompetence and featherbedding.

Available without charge from: NSF, US-India Program, Room 1212, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/357-9550.

Guide to Programs Fiscal 1988: National Science Foundation (91 pp.), latest edition, slickest ever, tells what NSF does and how to get some of it.

Available without charge from: NSF, Forms and Publications, 1800 G St. NW, Washington, DC 20550; tel. 202/357-7861.

OTA Publications (OTA-P-58; 51 pp.), listings of the hundreds of publications, big and little, produced by the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, including those available in reprints from commercial publishers as well as from the US Government Printing Office and the National Technical Information Service; order forms and price information included.

Available without charge from: Office of Technology Assessment, US Congress, Washington, DC 20510-8025; tel. 202/224-8996.

International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis: 1986 Annual Report (62 pp.), an inventory of ongoing programs and activities of the 16-nation research organization, based near Vienna. Spawned in 1972 by the Nixon-Brezhnev accords, IIASA has survived the Reagan cutoff of US government funds (partially replaced by private contributions channeled through the American Academy of Arts and Sciences). Current work includes research in health, environment, energy supply, and systems analysis.

Available without charge from: IIASA, Office of the Secretary, A-2361, Laxenburg, Austria; tel. (02236) 71521-0.

International Research Centers Directory 1988-89 (1567 pp., two volumes), "A World Guide to Government, University, Independent Nonprofit, and Commercial Research and Development Centers," fourth edition, lists 6000 research organizations in 145 countries, including national and international bodies; entries cover research topics, address, telephone number, staff size, publications, etc.

Available at \$360 per set from: Gale Research Co.,

Book Tower, Detroit, Michigan 48226 tel. 313/961-2242.

Atkinson to Head AAAS

Richard Atkinson, Chancellor of the University of California at San Diego, has been voted President-elect of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Atkinson, a former Director of the National Science Foundation, was opposed by Herman Feshbach, Professor of Physics at MIT. The current President-elect, Walter Massey, Vice President for Research at the University of Chicago, moves up to the AAAS Presidency in February, succeeding Sheila Widnall, of MIT.

Job Changes and Appointments

Roy Widdus, Director of the Division of International Health, Institute of Medicine, will join the World Health Organization in January as Global Program Coordinator of WHO's rapidly expanding AIDS activities, up from near nothing in recent years to \$60 million for 1988.

Gone and going from the National Science Foundation: C. Gordon Bell, Assistant Director for Computer and Information Science and Engineering, to Dana Group, Inc., Sunnyvale, Calif., as Vice President for Engineering; Charles N. Brownstein has been appointed acting Assistant Director. Also Nam P. Suh, NSF Assistant Director for Engineering, is phasing back to a fulltime return in January to MIT, where he's professor of mechanical engineering.

Newly appointed to the 12-member Advisory Council of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment: Neil Harl, Professor of Economics, Iowa State University; James C. Hunt, Vice President for Health Affairs, University of Tennessee; Joshua Lederberg, President, Rockefeller University, and Sally Ride, former astronaut, now at Stanford's Center for International Security and Arms Control.

To Order or Renew

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station, Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

- ☐ Renew my subscription; ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription; ☐ Please bill
Institutional subscribers: one year, \$225.00 ☐
two years, \$395.00 ☐

(Overseas airmail, \$30.00 per year additional.)

Name

Address

Zip

Toll-Free Subscription Service: 1-800-522-1970;
In Wash., D.C.: 785-5054

NIH Wary of Senate Bill to Intensify AIDS Programs

Senate floor action is expected before the end of the year on a comprehensive AIDS bill, "The AIDS Research, Information, and Care Act" (S 1220), backed by a bipartisan coalition that includes Senators Edward Kennedy (D-Mass.) and Orrin Hatch (R-Utah). The bill has been unanimously approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources; a companion bill is being prepared in the House Subcommittee on Health and the Environment, chaired by Rep. Henry Waxman (D-Calif.).

The NIH management, however, warily regards the bill as yet another well-intentioned but misguided attempt to run the Bethesda operation from Capitol Hill. Kennedy, during a busy period on the legislative calendar, took time November 18 to travel to the NIH campus to describe his bill to the semi-annual meeting of the NIH Director's Advisory Committee, which was devoted this time to AIDS.

The Senate version of the bill reflects the fading, but still strong, concern that the White House isn't committed to an all-out effort against AIDS. Congress obviously feels that way, as evidenced by its decision to add some \$180 million to the big budget increase that the Administration has requested for AIDS research and education programs in fiscal 1988. With the Congressional add-on, AIDS funds would total about \$950 million.

The Kennedy-Hatch legislation would go further in deploying the federal government against the disease. It would require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to declare AIDS a public-health emergency and double the size of the health emergency fund available to the Secretary.

The bill requires the HHS Secretary to submit a comprehensive AIDS plan to Congress, with emphasis on education and risk-reduction measures. Another provision calls for the Secretary to examine the creation of special consortia of academic, government, and industrial research organizations to cooperate in AIDS research. A "core national research program" on AIDS

would be legislated within the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID). And the Director of NIH would be required to establish a special Director's Advisory Committee on AIDS.

In his talk to the meeting, Kennedy noted that the Secretary of HHS has announced plans to establish his own advisory committee on AIDS. But, referring to the chaotic debut of the newly appointed Presidential Commission on AIDS—whose first chairman and staff director resigned within three months of their appointment—Kennedy expressed skepticism about the HHS advisory plan.

"I look forward to carefully reviewing the names of those nominated by HHS to serve on this critically important committee," he said, in reference to the HHS Secretary's announced plans. He added, "Congress feels strongly about the experts we recruit for this type of duty The last thing we need is an attempt to politicize the scientific and medical assault on the problem of AIDS."

The NIH brass was obviously pleased by the attendance of Kennedy, a durable and energetic supporter of biomedical research. But the chiefs openly expressed reservations about his bill. Anthony Fauci, Director of the NIAID—which manages 33 percent of NIH's AIDS research funds—said that he was "concerned about legislation that might shift things that are working well." NIH Director James Wyngaarden described the bill as "a well-meaning attempt," but said he was concerned that it "has a risk of ossifying programs."

David Baltimore, Director of the Whitehead Institute of Biomedical Research, suggested that public anxieties about progress against AIDS, along with political intrusions into research programs, could be arising from ignorance about the broadscale work in progress. "We may need an ad agency or a public relations firm to make known what we're doing," Baltimore said. The problem of communication, he added, extends to the scientific community, and he wondered aloud why *Science* magazine doesn't publish "a weekly article describing this or that program?"

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid
at Washington, D.C.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS INC.
SERIALS ACQUISITIONS
300 N. ZEEB RD.
ANN ARBOR, MI 48106

